

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 were pending in the application. Claims 1-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being deemed unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0010757 (Granik), U.S. Patent No. 5,751,961 (Smyk et al.), U.S. Patent No. 6,108,655 (Schleimer et al.), U.S. Publication No. 2002/0054114 (Shuping et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 6,895, 418 (Crow et al.). Of the Claims, Claims 1, 12 and 21 are independent. Applicant thanks the Examiner for entering the amendments to the Claims made in the Reply to the Final Office Action mailed on April 26, 2007. Claim 24 is newly added. Support for the newly added Claim is in the Applicants' specification as originally filed. (*See*, for example, Page 18, lines 18-22.) Claims have been amended to clarify the Applicants' invention. The application as amended and argued herein, is believed to overcome the rejections.

Regarding Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 12-14, and 21-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being deemed unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0010757 (Granik) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,751,961(Smyk).

Claims 4-8 and 15-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being deemed unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0010757 (Granik) as applied to Claims 1 and 2 above, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,751,961(Smyk) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,655 (Schleimer).

Claims 9 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being deemed unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0010757 (Granik) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,751,961(Smyk) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,895, 418 (Crow).

Claims 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being deemed unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0010757 (Granik) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,751,961(Smyk) in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0054114 (Shuping).

To establish a prima facie case for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation to combine reference teachings; (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; (3) the references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim

limitations. For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the Office has not established a prima facie case under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for claims 1-23 and that therefore, claims 1-23 are allowable.

Cited Reference, Granik discusses providing an address (URL) for downloading new advertising content that is determined based on user profile information. (*See* Granik, Abstract.)

Cited reference Smyk discusses an ISCP gateway that translates logical addresses in the URL standard to physical www addresses in the URL standard. The physical www addresses are used by web browsers to request documents. (*See* Smyk, Abstract.)

The references when combined do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations

Granik does not teach or suggest at least:

“transmitting from said content server to said end-user computer, in response to said end-user request, said content comprising at least one storage resource locator ("SRL")”

as claimed by the Applicants in Claim 1.

The URL discussed by Granik does not teach or suggest the Applicants’ claimed SRL. In contrast, the URL discussed by Granik describes a network location of a resource. The Applicants’ claimed “SRL” comprises a “unique file identifier generated from the contents of a file to identify the file associated with the content”. The SRL allows a network storage system to be “stateless”, that is, the unique file identifier is not associated with a particular physical location. Thus, files may be added, updated or stored in multiple locations in the storage system, and the location of the object files may be discovered in response to a specific request. (*See*, for example, Applicants’ specification, page 18, lines 2 – 12.).

The Applicants’ claimed SRL differs from the URL discussed in the prior art. As shown in the Applicants’ specification Fig. 25, the applicants’ claimed SRL transmitted to the storage center differs from the URL which is transmitted to the web browser. For example, cited prior art Smyk defines a URL to be a hard coded physical address. (*See* Smyk col. 2, lines 6-7.) Thus, the URL discussed by the prior art does not teach or suggest the Applicants’ claimed “SRL” which is defined in the Applicants’ specification to be a Storage Resource Locator and is based

on the “contents of the file” not on the address (location) (file path, that is, directories and filename).

Smyk does not teach or suggest:

‘wherein said SRL comprises a unique file identifier generated from the contents of a file to identify the file associated with said content’

as claimed by the Applicants in Claim 1.

Smyk merely discusses translating one address to another address, for example, a “logical address” to a “physical www address”. Both the logical address and the physical www address provide the location of a file. There is no teaching or suggestion of using “a unique file identifier generated from the contents of a file to identify the file” as claimed by the Applicants. In contrast, the addresses discussed by Smyk merely indicate the location of the file, that is, where the file is stored, for example, in a particular directory in a file system. As discussed earlier, the use of the Applicants’ claimed “unique file identifier generated from the contents of a file to identify the file associated with the content” allows a network storage system to be “stateless”, that is, the unique file identifier is not associated with a particular physical location. Thus, files may be added, updated or stored in multiple locations in the storage system, and the location of the object files may be discovered in response to a specific request. (*See*, for example, Applicants’ specification, page 18, lines 2 – 12.).

The file_path_string discussed by Smyk that includes “the file name and the directories that the file is stored in” does not teach the Applicants’ claimed “unique file identifier” that is “generated from the contents of a file”. In contrast, in Smyk’s system, “contents of a file” identified by a “file_path_string” may be stored at multiple addresses (physical/logical) in the system. Each file is uniquely addressed using the file_path_string which identifies the path used to locate the particular filename (directories, filename) associated with the file. (*See* Smyk, col. 3, lines 4-10.) Thus, Smyk merely discusses identifying a file based on name of the file and the where the file is stored.

Furthermore, merely including (embedding) a file name and a file's location in a file system as part of the contents of the file does not suggest the Applicants' claimed "unique file identifier generated from the contents of the file". Smyk's discussion of including a file name and location as part of the contents of the file does not teach or suggest "a unique file identifier" that is "generated from the contents of a file", that is, a unique file identifier that is not the file name and/or file location that may be embedded in the file but is "generated from the contents of a file".

Therefore, separately or in combination, Granik and Smyk do not teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention as claimed in Claim 1. Even if combined, the present invention as now claimed does not result as argued above.

Regarding rejection of dependent Claims 4 and 15, cited art Schleimer merely discusses embedding a URL in a web page. However, as already discussed, the URL discussed by Schleimer does not teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed "SRL". Thus, Schleimer does not teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed "embedding an SRL".

Furthermore, Granik is directed to an advertisement replacement system, Smyk is directed to Internet Services, Shuping and Schleimer are directed to a network browsing system and Crow is directed to extent based file systems. One of ordinary skill in the art of an advertisement replacement system would not look to Smyk, Shuping, Schleimer and to provide "transmitting from said content server to said end-user computer, in response to said end-user request, said content comprising at least one storage resource locator ("SRL"), wherein said SRL comprises a unique file identifier generated from the contents of a file to identify the file associated with said content" as claimed by the Applicants in claim 1.

Claims 1-11 and 24 are dependent claims that depend directly or indirectly on claim 1, which has been shown to be non-obvious over the cited art. Independent claims 12 and 21 recite a like distinction and are thus non-obvious over the cited art. Claims 12-20 depend directly or indirectly on claim 11 and claims 22-23 depend directly or indirectly on claim 21 and are thus non-obvious over the cited references.

Accordingly, the present invention as now claimed is not believed to be made obvious from the cited references. Removal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and acceptance of claims 1-24 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all claims (claims 1-24) are in condition of allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the above-referenced application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to Deposit Account Number 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 23, 2007

/Caroline M. Fleming/
Caroline M. Fleming
Reg. No. 45,566
Telephone No. (978) 553-7371